

EU, Latin America and its Crisis:
By Shomit Sirohi

Positivity is understood to mean a economic crisis which cannot resolve except as austerity, or social security slashes to sustain capitalism, but a critique of reified and positive terms is when the critique of wealth is also a dialectical critique, which means to negotiate within the category wealth is dual-sided base and superstructural unfolding. This then is the crisis of EU and Latin American lefts, that the positivity is a fixed rate which cannot be checked again to its change in valences.

I. Crisis and Dialectics – De-differentiation of economy and culture, French cinema

The French cinematic form, is finally at the same singular level as the French and therefore European economy, which then is competing against the American cinematic form, which in pure de-differentiation is the economy, culture and politics of EU and America in a constellation of current crises – the American form is finally against the European form as a dominant against a subordinate, which is equally the American cultural imperialism against the Arab constellation. This dominant and subordinate then has a contradiction which plays itself out as Arab Intifada or European crisis which then is also the nature of capitals in competition and plays itself out as the film “Sur Me Livres” in France which develops a feminine counterpart to a masculine gangster, which then is the de-differentiation of feminist politics and patriarchal counter-parts which develops into a model Le Pen, which then breaks into a French Macron style government, which is about the cinematic form breaking into a crisis with the Macron government being on the side of wealth and inequality, even as the feminism of their crisis is left out of the economic form as its exclusion. The opposite reading that the masculine gangster is finally the failure of the Macron government is in fact its redressal as a utopian leftist gaze is then the crisis of masculine petit-bourgeois and lumpen bourgeois developments which then is at another opposite level the crisis of French cinema as such – that the woman and feminine gaze reads the French government’s simple policies and economic reforms as finally “Read my Lips, Sur me Livres”, which means a feminine example of policies, that support wealth over poverty which also means supports the French woman over the generalized criminal male. A number of opposites adduce and the French form is a bunch of antinomies, support bourgeois wealth, but attack the poor, support poverty but then French economic crisis, support both but then find itself in a deadlock that wealth and poverty are both negotiated with to produce a synthesis which then fails again as their oppositional movement unfolds – and so the French crisis is a split gaze – that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, or sexual difference is finally a set of antinomies, not resolvable within the framework of even American imperialism and its cultural forms.

II. India and the World – French influenced Indian cinematic forms

So then the Indian choice is the same set of antinomies, which resolves its crisis by voting for poverty and against wealth, but retaining wealth as its expression in the sense of its destined goal – imagine the French topos of antinomies, resolved as a group of gangsters who serve the feminine counterpart – nothing other than the reversal – French men and their lover in women, who then report the formal crisis with an opposite – not that we impoverish the people, but from their standpoint

articulate the policy of capital – imagine the French form and its topos being reversed – a poor gangster who becomes wealthy and falls in love with his feminist counterpart without it being an imaginary resolution but a real resolution, a French Indian who works for the poor, women and earns his wealth to give to them.

III. Economic reforms comparing Latin America and India

So the crisis gets deeper in Bolivia and Ecuador not to mention Venezuela and Brazil, that man will always win over woman, that there is something like a antinomy which cannot be resolved, the left wins but then goes into crisis that the woman is afterall weaker and poorer, and that in fact the crisis cannot be resolved. Institutions then becomes a choice – on the side of the poorest, which then impoverishes all, and wealth is lost. The European game of choosing both, is here defeated with the authentic choice, the woman is given a vote and poverty its rights – and generalized poverty then ensues.

IV. Dialectics on the Economic Crisis, Institutions and Thinking without Positive terms

When the antinomy – American imperialism over a national particular is thought of in positive terms one receives the Latin American, Arab earlier and European crisis, it means that one fights EU against America, which helps EU, then within Spain one develops as in France and Greece a set of choices all failing to austerity so that capital wins against the poor – if I do the opposite – it is Latin America, the poor choice.

What the Arab world indicates with India is a third choice – that the antinomy is resolved within positive terms and reified categories such as capital, commodities or minimum wage and middle class civil society rights all of which are turned dialectical – yes capital but also poverty rights, no poverty alone but high wealth and finance, no to their victory with a negotiation, and like that positive crises in India – the victory of Congress leading to concessions for wealth against poverty which then also leads to a crisis when shifted to poverty, a number of non-sequitors, fought by thinking against positive terms – the dialectical motifs are – the practice of a contradiction and its developments.